Personal Names, Toponymes, and Gentile Nouns in Ladino and Spanish Translations of the Bible

Ora (Rodrigue) Shwarzwald

Bar-Ilan University

Introduction

Biblical personal names have been investigated from various semantic and interpretive approaches, many times involving Midrashic exegesis.[1] The linguistic study of biblical personal names has not reached a comprehensive appropriate description except for some sporadic comments.[2] Most grammar books and lexicons ignore these names. Medieval biblical lexicography disregarded them,[3] and modern lexicons vary:

---

1   See, for instance, David Mendel Harduf, *Biblical Proper Names* [in Hebrew], Izreel, Tel Aviv 1964; Moshe Garsiel, *Biblical Names: A Literary Study of Midrashic Derivations and Puns*, Bar-Ilan Press, Ramat Gan 1991.

2   See for instance, biblical commentators like Rashi, Ibn Ezra, RaDaQ and others. Ibn Ezra (when referring to Gershom and to Bela) and RaMBaN (Nahmanides; when referring to Makhpela) even claim that there is no grammar to proper names.
    The field of proper names is neglected in general linguistics as well. See Leonhard Lipka, "Word-formation and (proper) names: a neglected field", in Dieter Kastovsky, Christiane Dalton-Puffer and Nikolaus Ritt (eds.), *Words: Structure, Meaning, Function* (Trends in Linguistics 130), Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin 2000, pp. 187-203. Anderson's book deals mainly with syntactic aspects of the use of names; see John M. Anderson, *The Grammar of Names*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2007.

3   See for instance, Menahem Ben-Saruq, *Maḥberet Menaḥem* [Menachem's treatise], Chevrat Me'orere Yeshenim, Edinburgh 1854; Dunash Ben-Labrat, *Sefer Teshuvot Dunash Ben Labrat* [Dunash Ben Labrat responses book], Chevrat Me'orere Yeshenim, Edinburgh 1854(?); David Qimḥi, *Sefer ha-shorashim* [The Book of Roots], G. Bethge, Berlin 1847; Yona Ibn Janaḥ, *Sefer ha-shorashim* [The Book of Roots], translated by Yehuda ben Tibon, Itskovsky, Berlin 1896.

Kaddari discounts them while KBL includes them like any other nouns.[4] Biblical concordances do list them, Mandelkern lists them in a special section, and Even-Shoshan lists them alphabetically.[5] Modern lexicography does not include personal names unless the name carries a special meaning, e.g., Teraḥ "euphemism for an old man or for someone behaving like one".[6]

RaDaQ (R. David Qimḥi) includes personal names in his grammar book among regular nouns and classifies some of them as nouns derived from verbs (e.g., ראובן, שמעון, זבולון).[7] Gesenius treats personal names as regular nouns,[8] but he focuses especially on gentilic nouns.[9] He also discusses some personal names as retaining old grammatical cases.[10] Joüon and Muraoka claim that many personal names are formed as compound nouns (e.g., בליעל, גבריאל),[11] but they also treat personal names as regular nouns. They also discuss separately gentilic nouns with the -*i* suffix.[12]

Goshen Gottstein is the only one who discusses personal names and toponyms in his morphological analysis of biblical words. He includes personal names and toponyms among the continuous morphemes which are morphemes not derived by root and pattern combination. Most of them are not joinable, e.g., Moše, Levi, but some of them are because they accept derivational morphemes like the gentilic -*i* ending (the *nisba*), or the directional -*a* ending, e.g., *haReʾuveni* (<*Reʾuven*), *Doṯayna*

4   See Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und aramäsches Lexikon zum alten Testament,* Brill, Leiden-New York 1967-1990; Menahem Zevi Kaddari, *A Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew* [in Hebrew], Bar-Ilan University Press, Ramat Gan 2006.

5   See Solomon Mandelkern, *Concordantiae hebraicae atque chaldaicae*, Schocken, Jerusalem and Tel Aviv 1922; Abraham Even-Shoshan, *A New Concordance of the Bible* [in Hebrew], Kiryat Sefer, Jerusalem 1977.

6   See for instance Abraham Even-Shoshan, *Even-Shoshan's Dictionary* [in Hebrew], Am Oved, Kineret Zmora Bitan, Dvir and Yediot Aḥaronot, Tel Aviv 2003, p. 2039.

7   See David Qimḥi, *Sefer Mikhlol* [Ensemble Book] (H. Petsoll, based on Fiorda 1793), Jerusalem 1966, p. 104b.

8   See Wilhelm Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar*, ed. by Emil Kautzsch, trans. by Arthur Ernst Cowley. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1910, §85s-t.

9   See Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar,* §86h (Note 8).

10 See Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar,* §90 (Note 8).

11 See Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, Roma 2006.

12 See Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar*, §137c, §139d (Note 11).

(<*Doṯan*).[13] Ephratt's study tried to find grammatical principles in the assignment of toponyms by an Israeli Name Committee, but she did not consider the biblical names.[14] This review will take too long if I list all the books and articles that examined biblical personal names, but as mentioned earlier, they all treat these names with interpretive and Midrashic approaches, not with linguistic ones.[15]

Comparison of biblical names in the translations of various languages has been done before.[16] The purpose of this study is to examine the representation of names—personal names and toponyms—and their gentilic derivatives in Bible translations into Spanish in the Middle Ages and in the Ladino translations of the Sephardic Diaspora after the expulsion from Spain. Because personal names and toponyms are a singular entity from a morphological point of view, and because gentilic nouns are derived systematically from them, I would like to compare these names in the translations to the extent there is a correlation between the way people and locations are named as well as consider the gentilic nouns derived from them. Moreover, such a comparison between the pre- and post-exilic translations can either support or oppose the assumption that the Ladino translations are based on the Spanish ones.

---

13 See Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, "Semitic Morphological Structures: The Basic Morphological Structure of Biblical Hebrew", in Haïm B. Rosén (ed.), *Studies in Egyptology and Linguistics in Honour of H.J. Polotsky*, Israel Exploration Society, Jerusalem 1964, pp. 104-116.

14 See Michal Ephratt, "Is there a Grammar to Names of Settlements?" [in Hebrew], *Lěšonénu* 48-49 (1985-1986), pp. 5-30, 137-150.

15 I mention here a few articles published in Demsky's most recent anthology series of 2011: Aaron Demsky (ed.), *These Are the Names: Studies in Jewish Onomastics*, vol. 5, Bar-Ilan University Press, Ramat Gan 2011. Yael Avrahami, "Name Giving to the Newborn in the Hebrew Bible", in Demsky (ed.), pp. 15-53; Joel S. Burnett, "Divine Absence Personal Names in the Hebrew Bible", in Demsky (ed.), pp. 71-93; Aaron Demsky, "'Ghost-names' in the Bible", in Demsky (ed), pp. 119-129; Yaacov Kaduri (James Kugel), "On Biblical Names and Later Etymologies", in Demsky (ed.), pp. 143-155; Hananel Mack, "Mehetabel, the Daughter of Matred, the Daughter of Me'zahab—Three Biblical Names in Light of the Classical Commentaries" [in Hebrew], in Demsky (ed.), pp. cxiii-cxxxi.

16 For instance, Ezra Zion Melamed, "The Onomasticon of Ausevius" [in Hebrew], *Tarbiẕ* 3 (1932), pp. 314-327, 393-409; 4 (1933), pp. 78-96, 249-284; G. Lisowsky, *Die Transkription der hebräischen Eigennamen des Pentateuch in der Septuaginta*, Dissertation, Universitaet Basel 1940; Joseph Horowitz, *Jewish Proper Names and Derivatives in the Koran*, Georg Olms, Hildesheim 1964; Yosef Tobi, "Translation of Personal Names in Medieval Judeo-Arabic Bible Translations" [in Hebrew], in Aaron Demsky (ed.), *These Are the Names: Studies in Jewish Onomastics*, vol 3, Bar-Ilan University Press, Ramat Gan 2002, pp. 77-

The Corpus

The medieval biblical Spanish translations examined in this study are Escorial E3, E4, E5/E7, and E19, and the Alba Bible. All these versions and others appear today online at http://corpus.byu.edu/bibliamedival/ and they include access to photocopies of the originals. Some of the versions were previously published in print copies.[17] Not all the names were exemplified from E19 because some of the chapters were missing from it. The Ladino Bibles are the Pentateuch from Constantinople 1547,[18] and the entire Bible from Constantinople and Thessaloniki from 1540 to 1572[19] (from here on C), and the Ferrara Bible from 1553 (F).[20] The medieval and Ferrara Bibles are all written in Latin letters, whereas C is written in Hebrew square vocalized letters.

84; Yosef Tobi, "Translation of Proper Names in Medieval Judeo-Arabic Translations of the Bible", *Bulletin of the Israeli Academic Center in Cairo* 21 (1997), pp. 18-22; Tamar Zewi, "Proper Names in the Samaritan Version of RaSaG's Translation to the Pentateuch" [in Hebrew], paper read at the Fourth International Congress of the Jewish Traditions Research Center on Original and Translated texts in Jewish Languages, Jerusalem, June 21-24, 2010 (to appear in *Journal of Semitic Studies*).

17 See Oliver H. Hauptmann (ed.), *Escorial Bible I.j.4*, Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies (HSMS), Philadelphia 1953; Oliver H. Hauptmann and Mark G. Littlefield (eds.), *Escorial Bible I.j.4*, HSMS, Madison 1987; Mark G. Littlefield (ed.), *Escorial Bible I.ii.19*, HSMS, Madison 1992; Mark G. Littlefield (ed.), *Escorial Bible I.I.7*, HSMS, Madison 1996; Moshe Lazar (ed.), *Biblia Ladinada: Escorial I.j.3*, HSMS, Madison 1995; Antonio Paz y Meliá (ed.), *La Biblia de la Casa de Alba*, Madrid 1920-1922.

18 See Moshe Lazar (ed.), *Ladino Pentateuch: Constantinople 1547*, Labyrinthos, Culver City 1988. The version is online at the National Library in Jerusalem.

19 See Moshe Lazar, (ed.), *The Ladino Scriptures: Constantinople – Salonica [1540-1572]*, I-II, Labyrinthos, Lancaster, CA. 2000.

20 See Moshe Lazar (ed.), *The Ladino Bible of Ferrara [1553]*, Labyrinthos, Culver City 1992. And see also Iacob M. Hassán and Ángel Berenguer Amador (eds.), *Introducción a la Biblia de Ferrara*, Comisión Nacional Quinto Centenario, Madrid 1994.
The transcription in the Ferrara Bible uses the following conventions consistently: *Ḥet* is represented by *h* and rarely by *ch*. *Ayin* and *He* are also represented by *h*; they are absent infrequently. *Shin, Sin, Tsadi,* and *Samekh* are represented by *s*, but *Samekh* is copied sometimes by *c* before the vowels *i* and *e*, and *Tsadi* rarely by *z*. *Lene Bet* is copied by *b* or *v*, and *Vav* by *u* or *v*. *Ṭet* and *Tav* are represented by *t* and *Lene Tav* sometimes by *th*. *Kaf* and *Qof* are copied by *k*, *c* (in front of *a, o, u* or a consonant) and sometimes *qu*, and Lene *Kaf* mostly by *ch* or *h*. Common to the writings of that time, there is no distinction between *i-j-y* and *u-v*. These representations are also typical of the medieval Bibles.

Because of the Latin script, one might assume that the personal names in the Ferrara Bible will be similar to the same names in the medieval Bibles, but this happens rarely, only in cases in which the medieval Bibles transcribe the Hebrew names. As we will see, most of the names are not transcribed in the medieval Bibles.

Two hundred and seventy-two examples were drawn in this study, most of them from the Pentateuch, especially from Genesis, but there are a few examples from other parts of the Bible (272 tokens belonging to 174 types[21]). The list of verses from which the examples were taken appears in the Appendix. The number of types and tokens will be presented separately in each section, first personal names, followed by toponyms, and finally gentilic nouns. A discussion will conclude the article.

Findings

(1) Personal names:
People's names are copied in their Hebrew pronunciation quite systematically in C and F, for instance:

משה: מֹשֶׁה, Moseh
פרעה: פַּרְעֹה, Parho
רבקה: רִבְקָה, Ribkah
תרח: תֶּרַח, Terah
יהודי: יְהוּדִי, Yehudi

Of 125 tokens of personal names, which represent 95 types, there is a difference between C and F only in six names (5% tokens, 6% types). In all 125 tokens, C copies faithfully the biblical Hebrew name in the translations, whereas F demonstrates some change in the pronunciation in six names: חֵת is transcribed once as *Hed* and another time as *Heth*, apparently as some representation of *Lene Tav*.[22] כְּדָרְלָעֹמֶר is copied as *Cedorlahomer*, not with an initial *k* or *qu*, but rather with an initial *c*. Since this spelling occurs five times,[23] it cannot be viewed as a typographical error, but rather represents

---

21 Tokens are the instances of a unit; type is the unit itself, a name in our case, e.g., the type תרח has 11 tokens in the Bible: nine in Genesis, one in Joshua, and one in Chronicles.

22 See David M Bunis, "The Whole Hebrew Reading Tradition of Ottoman Judezmo Speakers: The Medieval Iberian Roots", *Hispania Judaica Bulletin* 9 (2013), pp. 15-67.

23 It occurs in Genesis 14:1, 4, 5, 9, 17.

[*sedorla'omer*] or [*tsedorla'omer*] (closely resembling E5/E7, see below). The names כַּסְלֻחִים and פַּתְרֻסִים are transcribed *Caslohim* and *Patrosim* with the vowel *o* instead of *u*. The name לוט is copied as *Loth*, although *th* is typical in his transcription for the representation of *Lene Tav*, not *Ṭet*. Finally, the name שֶׁלַח is transcribed *Salah* like the pausal form that occurs in the same verse (Gen. 10:24).

Unlike C and F, in the medieval translations there are no similar translations in 86 of the 125 tokens (69% of the tokens[24]). Here are a few examples:

אבימלך: abi malech; abimelec; abemeleque

אברם: abran; abrahan; abram

אסנת: aznad; aznat; asnath

ארכפשד: arapagsad; arpasat; arpad; arphachsad

בן שמעי: fijo de simj; fijo de symi; njeto de senhi; fiio de simey

הגר: agar; hagar

הרן: aran; aram; haran

חֵת: hed; quiuet; ed; etheu

יהודי: yahudi; yehudi; yehuedi, yendi; iudi[25]

כדרלעמר: cador laomer; çardolaomer; chodorloomer

כנען: canaam; canaham; canaan

כסלֻחים: chesluym; enjluym; cazloym

מצרים: mjzraym, los egipçianos (E3); egipto (E4×2); mjcrayn, mjzrraym (E5/E7); mesrayim, mesraym (Alba)

משה: muysen; moysen

מתושלח: mathusalam; matusalen; matuselah

פרעה: faraon; faron

רבקה: rebeca; rrabeca

רַעֲמָה: rahma; nagma, ragama; rregina; regma

תֶּרַח: tare; thare; tareh

---

24   The types were not calculated in this case because in many instances the same personal name is translated in different ways, sometimes when occurring twice within the same verse.

25   The name יהודי (Jer. 36:21) in E5/E7 is translated once *yehuedi* and once *yendi*. The *yendi* form appears also in Jer. 36:23 which means that it is not a typographical error (*u-n* misreading?). E3 copies the name יהודי always as *yahudi*, E4 copies the Hebrew pronunciation *yehudi*, and Alba shortens the name to *iudi*.

The name מצרים is of special interest. As a personal name it is copied in C and F (*Misraim*). Some of the medieval Bibles copy this name as *mjzrraym* and *mjcrayn* in E5/E7. E3 has *mjzraym* in Gen. 10:13, but in Gen. 10:6 it is *los egipçianos*. Alba uses a close transcription of the name *mesrayim* and *mesraym*, but E4 translates it twice as a place name, *egipto*. I will further relate to this name later in the following sections.

The medieval translations show different linguistic traditions from the biblical names. Although some of the transcribed names are faithful to the Hebrew Bible (e.g., some of the translations of יהודי, and אברם, הגר, הרן), there is no consistency among the versions in retaining the Hebrew tradition. Some of the names have already appeared in the Latin translation of the Bible, e.g., נֹחַ — Noe, תרח — *Thare*, but not in the translation of משה, which is *Moses* in Latin. A comparison of the similar names in the various translations shows that only 32 names (27%) have partial similarity to the Ladino translations C and F. Some of the names in translation retained the traditional pronunciation of the Hebrew names, though not consistently.

It should be noted that women's names are scarce: אסנת, הגר, חוה, רבקה, מרים, שרה (×2), and שרי (a total of 8, 6% types or tokens). This result confirms another finding; only 7% of the biblical personal names are names of women.[26]

Three names from Gen. 25:3 were not included in the 125 names above: אַשּׁוּרִם, וַיָקְשָׁן יָלַד אֶת שְׁבָא וְאֶת דְּדָן וּבְנֵי דְדָן הָיוּ אַשּׁוּרִם and לְטוּשִׁים and לְאֻמִּים. The verse states: וּלְטוּשִׁים וּלְאֻמִּים "and Jokshan was the father of Sheba and Dedan; the descendants of Dedan were Ashurim/Ashurites, Letushim/Letushites and Leumin/Leummites". Because of the *-im* (plural ending), it is unclear whether these are people's names or gentilic nouns. The old biblical translators to Aramaic and the biblical interpreters wavered about the correct nomenclature.[27] According to these translations, they are personal names because they are copied in the translations:

---

26 See Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald, "First Names in Sephardi Communities" in Aaron Demsky (ed.), *Pleasant Are Their Names: Jewish Names in the Sephardi Diaspora*, University Press of Maryland, Bethesda 2010, p. 197n30.

27 The Aramaic translators interpreted these names as nouns indicating features or attributes. Rashi interprets the first two as names of the rulers of nations, in opposition to Onkelos' interpretation, and claims that the third refers to scattered tent owners. Ibn Ezra claims that they are personal names and opposes the view that they are gentilic nouns. RaDaQ also treats them as personal names and raises the question why they have the *-im* ending. RaDaQ adds that in the name מצרים the ending *-ayim* is also a plural marker.

C: אשורים, לאומים, לְטוּשִׁים
F: Assurim, Leumim, Letusim
E3: asurym, leumjm, lemryn(!)
E4: asurin, leuim(!), letusin
E5/E7: asurim, leumjn, letusin
Alba: asurim, laumjm, latusym

Only E5/E7 copies the names in their Hebrew pronunciation, but replaces the final m by n. Alba transcribes the schwa as *a*, but the name resembles the Hebrew tradition.

(2) Toponyms:

Of 66 tokens of toponyms in this study, 46 are types. C and F generally copy these names in their Hebrew pronunciation, e.g.,

גיחון: גיחון; Guihon
כלנה: (ו)כַלְנֵה; Chalne
עין משפט: עין משפט; Hen Mispat
עדן: עדן; Heden
עמורה: עֲמֹרָה; Hamora
רחובות: רְחֹבֹת; Rechobot

Nevertheless, there is a greater variety in toponym translations in C and F than in personal names. F differs from C in sixteen tokens (24%) that belong to eight types (17%), nine of which are the name מצרים. These are the names:

ואליי די כשדים: אוּר כַּשְׂדִּים; Vr de Caldeos (C keeps כשדים, while F keeps אור)
ליינוראש די ממרא: אֵלֹנֵי מַמְרֵא (Abundance of Mamre); Enzinas de Mamre (oaks of Mamre)
אשור: אשור; Assyria (Gen. 10:11); אשור; Assur (Gen. 2:14, 25:18; Num. 24:24)
כוש: כוש; Ethiopia
מצרים: מצרים; Egypt (×9)
עזה: עזה; Gazza
עשתרות קרנים: עַשְׁתְּרֹת קַרְנַיִם; Hasderot Carnaim
פרת: פרת; Euphrates

F is also inconsistent in the orthography of some names: אדמה is spelled *Hadma* in Gen. 10:19, but *Adma* in Gen. 14:2; גְרָר is spelled *Guerar* in Gen. 20:2, but *Gerar* in Gen. 10:19; כנען is *Chenaan* in Gen. 11:31, but *Kenahan* in Gen. 47:15. These names are not many, yet they use the same pronunciation tradition.

The resemblance among the medieval translations is even smaller. Forty-six of the 66 toponyms are not translated in the same manner (70%), although sometimes they are similar to each other (overlooking spelling differences). Here again, there is no point in examining tokens, because the same toponym may vary in different verses of the same translation. Here are a few examples:

אַדְמָה: adma (E3×2, E4, Alba×2); adama (E4); adina (E5/E7×2)

אור כשדים: vrcasdin (E3); hur de los caldeos (E4, E5/E7), ur caldeorum (Alba)

אלֹנֵי מַמְרֵא: enzinas de manbre (E3); enzinar de manbre (E4, E5/E7); valles de manbre (Alba)

אֶרֶךְ: erog; yereth; yeoreg; erech

אַשּׁוּר: asur (E3×4, E4×3, E5/E7×2, E19×2, Alba×1); asyria (E4), assyrios, siria, assur (Alba)[28]

כּוּשׁ (ארץ): de los negros (E3); de judia (E4); de Ethiopia (Alba)

מִצְרֵיִם (Gen. 43:32): los egipçianos (E3, E5/E7, Alba); los egepçianos (E4); los egibtanos (E19); (In eight other verses): egibto (×5), egipto, los egibtanos (E19); egipto (all the others)

עֵדֶן: parayso (E3), deleyte (E4), vergel (Alba)

פרת: parad (E3); eufrates (E4, Alba)

רְחֹבֹת: Rahobod (E3); reobot (E4); rreouod (E5/E7); rrooboth (Alba)

Two phenomena are evident in these translations: (a) Even when the medieval translations resemble the Hebrew biblical names, these names are pronounced differently from the same names in the Ladino translations (compare, for instance, the names רחובות, and אדמה, פרת); (b) many of the toponyms are identified with well-known place names known to the Spaniards either from the Latin translations or from other sources, or from interpretations given to these names, e.g., כוש — Aethiopiae, אור כשדים — Ur Chaldeorum, כנען — Chanaan, etc.

As noted above, the name מצרים appeared as a personal name. In the medieval Bibles there were variations in the translations, either as a personal name, or as a toponym. As a personal name, some of the medieval versions showed some similarities to the Hebrew name, but as a toponym they opted for the name *Egipto*, as found in F as well, though some of them related to it as a gentilic name. Likewise the name כוש: as a personal name, it has been copied in the medieval Bibles — *cus* in all the Escorial

---

28   In some cases, some of the toponyms are not translated.

Bibles (and in F), *chus* in Alba. However, as a toponym, כוש is interpreted: *los negros* (the blacks), *judia* (Judea) or *Ethiopia* (like F). Whereas interpretive cases are rare in C and F, they are abundant in the medieval translations.

Only 13 toponyms show resemblance between C and F on the one hand, and the medieval translations on the other. This amount is lower than the one found among personal names.

(3) Gentilic nouns:

Gentilic nouns are derived from personal names, toponyms, or other social attributes, such as religion, and they function as adjectives or nouns.[29] Most of the gentilic nouns in this study were derived from toponyms or from personal names by *-i* suffixation: עברי is derived from עבר, כנעני from כנען and מצרי from מצרים. Sometimes there is no such ending but the nouns are nevertheless gentilic, as discussed below.

Seventy-six tokens of gentilic nouns represent 30 types, most of them from the Pentateuch, and a few from other books: ימיני in Esther 2:5, יהודי in Esther 2:5, 3:4, Zech. 8:23. As יהודי is also a personal name as referenced above, it is worth comparing it to its translation as a gentilic noun.

C differs from F in 39 tokens (51%) which are 10 types (33%). This percentage is higher than the ones found in place and personal names, but it is still low, because most of the words (two-thirds of the types) are translated in the same manner. Inconsistencies are revealed in the translations of the same names in different verses. The data are classified into three categories: (a) similarities between C and F; (b) variations in different verses; (c) total difference between C and F.

a. Similarities between Constantinople and Ferrara:

הָאֵימִים: לוש אמים:; los Emim

הָאַרְמִי: איל ארמי; el Arami (×2)

הַגִּרְגָשִׁי: איל גרגשי; -l Guirgasi[30]

יהודי: ג׳ודייו; Judio (×3)

יְמִינִי: די בנימן; de Binyamin

---

29 In fact more adjectives can be derived from other names, e.g., תחתי-תחת, ששי-שש, רגלי- רגל. See Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar* (Note 11), p. 242.

30 The dash before *l* indicates that the Spanish definite article was attached to other morphemes, such as *al* 'to the; ACC.', *del* 'of the'.

רְפָאִים :רפאים; Refaim

אִיל קיני :הַקֵּינִי; -l Keni

אִיל קניזי :הַקְּנִזִּי; -l Kenizi

אִיל עמלקי :הָעֲמָלֵקִי; el Hamaleki

b. Variations between C and F in different verses:

אִיל אמורי~אִיל אמרי :האמורי (×5); -l Hemori, el Emori (×2), el Emoreo (×2)

אִיל חוי :החוי (×3); -l Heui, el Hiueo (×2)

אִיל חתי :החתי (×4); -l Hiti, el Hiteo (×2), el Heti

אִיל יבוסי :היבוסי (×4); el Yebusi (×2), el Yebuseo (×2)

אִיל כנעני :הכנעני (×6); el Chenaani (×4), el Kenahaneo (×2)

אִיל פריזי :הפרזי (×3); el Perezeo (×2), -I Perezi

c. Consistent difference between C and F:

נִיגְרָה, לה כושית :(ה)כֻּשִׁית; la Ethiopissa; Ethiopissa (Num. 12:1)

ג׳ודיאה, ג׳ודיו :ישראלי :(לה) el Ysraelita, (la) Ysraelita, ישראלית, הישראלית (Lev. 24:10)

לוש ,לה ג׳ודיאה (×5), ג׳ודייו ,איל ג׳ודיאו ,איל ג׳ודייו :העברי, העבריה, העברים, עברי ג׳ודיוש (x2); el Hebreo (×2), la Hebrea, Hebreo (×5), los Hebreos (×2)

In the first group, most of the gentilic nouns are copied in their Hebrew pronunciation, except for the noun יהודי. In the second group, C tends to copy the Hebrew names which F either copies or changes into their Spanish equivalent ending in *-eo*.

Three nouns are distinct in C and F, כושית, ישראלי(ת) and עברי. Regarding כושית, C uses the word כושית once, but in its second occurrence he interprets it as נִיגְרָה 'black', whereas F uses the gentilic noun *Ethiopissa* in both cases (The verse says "And וַתְּדַבֵּר מִרְיָם וְאַהֲרֹן בְּמֹשֶׁה עַל־אֹדוֹת הָאִשָּׁה הַכֻּשִׁית אֲשֶׁר לָקָח כִּי־אִשָּׁה כֻשִׁית לָקָח Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses because of the Cushite woman whom he had married; for he had married a Cushite woman"). Regarding ישראלי and עברי, C consistently interprets them as Jewish – ג׳ודייו, whereas F adjusts the names to the Spanish equivalent of ישראלי – *Ysraelita* and עברי – *Hebreo*.

The variations are much greater among medieval translations. In fact, only four tokens (5%) of gentilic nouns show resemblance among the translations. Three of the tokens are the translation of יהודי as *judio* (like C and F), and one token is the translation of העברי – *el ebreo* only in Gen. 14:13, but not in any other place. All

other tokens are diverse. The examples below show the same gentilic nouns presented above in the Ladino translations, with three additional examples.[31]

הָאֵימִים: los emjn; los gayanes; los emonjm; los emim (Alba resembles C and F)

הארמי: el aramj; de aram; el aramj; el aramj [de mesopotania]

הגרגשי: gujrjasi; guirgaseos; el gergasi; -l gargasy

יהודי: Judio (×3) (all versions)

ימיני: de biñamjn; benjaminista; benjamjnj; de benjamin

רפאים: los gigantes; los gigantes; los rrefaym; los raphaim

האמורי: emori, -l emory (×4), el emory;// los emorreos (×2), amorreos, emoreos, los emoreos (×2), el emoreo;// -l emori, el emori (×3), el emorreo, los emorreos;// el hemory;// los emoreos, -l emorri (×2), el emory, el emori (×2)

החוי: -l hiuj (×3);// los yne, yneos, los vneos;// el euj (×2), el ebi;// el yuj;// el hiuj, el hjuj (×3)

החתי: el hity (×4);// yteos, los yteos (×2), el yteo;// el ety (×2), -l eti, el yteo;// el hity (×2);// hiti, el hity, los oteos, el hiteño

היבוסי: -l yebuçi, yaybuçi, el abuçi (×2);// los gebuçeos (×3), gebuzeos;// -l eboçi, el eboçi (×3);// el ebuçi (×2);// los jebuseos, -l gebusi, el yebuçi, el jebuci

(ה)ישראלית, ישראלי: de ysrrael, ysrraelj, la yzraela;// de ysrrael, ysrraelita, la ysrraelita;// ysrraelid (×2), la ysrraelid;// de ysrrael, judia (×2);// de Israel (×2), aquella judia

(ה)כֻשִׁית: cuxia;// etiopensa;// cusid (×2);// estrañja;// cusyth [ethiopiana], cusyth

הכנעני: -l cananj (×2), de canaan (×2), el cananj (×2);// los cananeos (×4), de los cananeos;// -l canaanj (×2), de canaam (×2), canaan, el cananj;// el cananeo (×2);// los cananeos (×2), del chanaani (×2), el cananeo (×2)

הפְּרִזִי: el parezi (×3);// perizeos (×2), los perizeos;// el perezi (×2), -l seresi;// el faryseo (×2);// el parisj (×2), los phariseos

העברי, העבריה, העברים, עברי: el ebreo (×2), la ebrea, los ebreos (×2), hebreo, judio, ebreo (×3);// el ebreo (×2), la ebrea, los ebreos (×2), ebreo (×5);// judio, el ebreo, judia, los ebreos (×2), ebreo (×5);// el judio, la judia, los judios (×2), judio (×5);// judio (×6), el ebreo, judia, los judios (×2), los ebreos

הַקֵּינִי: -l qujnj; quineos; -l qujnj; los çineçeos

---

31 The data is presented in the following order: E3, E4, E5/E7, E19 (if there are examples), and Alba. The examples from each version are separated by a semi-colon followed by two slashes. To avoid complications the exact citations of verses are not listed.

הַקְּנִזִּי: -l qujnjzi; los quizeos; -l qujnjzi; los canjzeos

הָעֲמָלֵקִי: amaleque; los enblaycos; el amalequjm; los amalechitas

In addition to the many variants within the medieval Bibles, there is diversity within the same translation in different places. This diversity is atypical in the Ladino translations.[32] In many cases, the translation uses the plural form instead of the singular (e.g., האמורי, החוי, החתי, etc.). Sometimes the final *m* is replaced by *n* (e.g., האימים here, and אור כשדים among the toponyms or אשורים, לטושים, לאומים at the end of section (1)). Many gentilic nouns end in Spanish *-eo* to indicate the person, both in F and in the medieval translations (e.g., see the translations of החוי, החתי, היבוסי, הכנעני העברי, הפריזי). But the most striking phenomenon is the remoteness of the medieval translations from the biblical Hebrew nouns. This phenomenon is in contrast to F. In F, we find the use of the Spanish formation with the -*eo* suffix; however, the basic gentilic noun remains close to the Hebrew word (cf. for instance the translations of גרגשי, חוי, יבוסי, רפאים, קניזי).

As shown above, the translation of the words ישראלי and עברי clearly distinguish C from F: C translates it ג'ודייו 'Jewish', while F translates the Spanish equivalent *Ysraelita* and *Hebreo*, respectively. In the medieval Bibles, the two traditions—*ebreo* (mostly without *h*) and *judio*—exist side by side in all the translations, except E4 that opts for *ebreo*, but the translation of (ישראלי(ת)) shows many variations. The translation of כושית is also varied both in the Ladino (as shown above) and the medieval Spanish translations, and it is partly based on Midrashic exegesis. Most of the medieval translations do not repeat the word in the translation. E19 explains כושית as *estrañja* 'strange', E3 copies it as *cuxia* (pronounced [*kušia*]), Alba and E5/ E7 adopt the Hebrew word with some variation, although in its first occurrence Alba interprets it in parentheses as Ethiopian [*ethiopiana*] (which slightly resembles E4's *etiopensa*, and Ferrara's *Ethiopissa*).

The translation of מצרי (12×),[33] represented as המצרי, המצרית, למצרים, מצרי and, מצרַים, deserves special discussion. Here is its distribution:

C: אלוש (4×), מִצְרַיִם, לה אג'יבסייאנה (3×), (איל) אַג'יבסייאנו, איל מצרי, מצרי לוש די מצרים, מצריים

F: -l Egypciano, la Egypçiana, Egyptianos (×2), a los egypçianos, Egypto (×3), Egypciano (×3)

---

32 The example of הכושית is exceptional in C.

33 In some versions there is no representation for all of the word's occurrences.

E3: el egipçiano (×2), la egipçiana, alos egipçianos, egipçiano (×2), los egibçianos, los egipçianos (×4), egibçiano

E4: el egipçiano, -l egepçiano, el egepçiana(!), alos egepçianos, egepçiano (×2), egipto (×2), los egepçianos (×2), egipçiano

E5/E7: el egipçiano (×2), la egipçiana, alos egipçianos, egipçiano (×2), los egipçianos (×2), egipto, los de egipto, egibçiano

E19: el egibtano (×2), a los egibtanos, egibtano (×3), los egibtanos (×2), los egebçianos

Alba: -l egipçiano, el egipçiano, la egipçiana, para los egipçianos, egipçiano (×3), los egipçianos (×5)

C uses the Hebrew base מצרי eight times; four other times the Spanish equivalents אג׳יבסייאנו or אג׳יבסייאנו are used.[34] As indicated above, מצרים, as a personal name and as a toponym has always been copied as מצרים in C. F uses the Spanish equivalents consistently, as is done in the toponyms (contrary to the representation of personal names).

All the medieval translations use the Spanish name inconsistently. Next to *egipçiano* one finds mostly *egibtano* in E19. The use of *b* instead of *p* occurs rarely in the other versions as well, cf. *egipçiano—egibçianos*. Moreover, there is also variation in the vowel, *egepçiano* in E4, and *egebçianos* in E19.

As noted in the Hebrew list of occurrences, I included the name מצרים among them, and not only variations of מְצְרִי. Syntactic agreement is the reason for this choice, because מצרים sometimes refers to the people, and not to the name of the country. Here are the instances:

Gen. 45:2: וַיִּתֵּן אֶת־קֹלוֹ בִּבְכִי וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ מִצְרַיִם וַיִּשְׁמַע בֵּית פַּרְעֹה "He wept loudly; the Egyptians heard it and Pharaoh's household heard about it".

Gen. 47:15: וַיִּתֹּם הַכֶּסֶף מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וּמֵאֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן וַיָּבֹאוּ כָל מִצְרַיִם אֶל יוֹסֵף לֵאמֹר הָבָה לָּנוּ לֶחֶם וְלָמָּה נָמוּת נֶגְדֶּךָ כִּי אָפֵס כָּסֶף "When the money from the lands of Egypt and Canaan was used up, all the Egyptians came to Joseph and said, 'Give us food! Why should we die before your very eyes because our money has run out?'"

Gen. 47:20: וַיִּקֶן יוֹסֵף אֶת כָּל אַדְמַת מִצְרַיִם לְפַרְעֹה כִּי מָכְרוּ מִצְרַיִם אִישׁ שָׂדֵהוּ כִּי

---

34 The spelling with *bet* instead of *pe* in such circumstances is quite common in that era. See Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald, "Orthography and Pronunciation in Two Ladino Prayer Books for Women" (in Hebrew), *Massorot* 15 (2010), pp. 198-199.

חָזַק עֲלֵהֶם הָרָעָב וַתְּהִי הָאָרֶץ לְפַרְעֹה "So Joseph bought all the land of Egypt for Pharaoh. Each of the Egyptians sold his field, for the famine was severe. So the land became Pharaoh's".

וַיִּמְלְאוּ לוֹ אַרְבָּעִים יוֹם כִּי כֵּן יִמְלְאוּ יְמֵי הַחֲנֻטִים וַיִּבְכּוּ אֹתוֹ מִצְרַיִם שִׁבְעִים Gen. 50:3: יוֹם "They took forty days, for that is the full time needed for embalming. The Egyptians mourned for him seventy days".

וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל הָעָם אַל תִּירָאוּ הִתְיַצְּבוּ וּרְאוּ אֶת יְשׁוּעַת ה׳ אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה לָכֶם Ex. 14:13: הַיּוֹם כִּי אֲשֶׁר רְאִיתֶם אֶת מִצְרַיִם הַיּוֹם לֹא תֹסִפוּ לִרְאֹתָם עוֹד עַד עוֹלָם "Moses said to the people, 'Do not fear! Stand firm and see the salvation of the Lord that he will provide for you today; for the Egyptians that you see today you will never, ever see again'".

In four of the 76 gentilic nouns there is similarity between the Ladino and the medieval translations: in the translation of עברי (Alba excluded),[35] and יהודי, in the two occurrences of המצרי and המצרית shown above, and in the translation of הָאַרְוָדִי (E4 excluded),[36] which transliterate the name. As in the case of personal names, feminine gentilic nouns are rare: 6 tokens (8%)

Discussion

The data presented above prove that there is a hierarchy in the Ladino translations of the names examined in this study. Personal names are the ones copied in the translation in the highest rate followed by toponyms. Gentilic nouns are at the lowest end of the scale where there are some variations among the translations. Medieval translations show more variations in all the types of names.

Personal names are very arbitrary. Toponyms are related to certain locations which are identified and interpreted in some ways in Spanish, therefore the variation increases in them. Gentilic nouns are morphologically different from personal names and toponyms. The Hebrew derivation with the suffix -*i* enables the equivalent formations in Spanish with the -*eo* suffix in Ladino, hence many of the gentilic nouns

---

35   The word עֵבֶר in Num. 24:24 is interpreted as a gentilic noun. In his translation only Alba uses a gentilic noun: los *ebreos*, contrary to all the others that copy it: *ever*, *eber*, *euer* in medieval translations, עבר in C and *Heber* in F.

36   E4 translates it as *arbadeos*.

were derived in this way, and the basic name remained untouched as the translations of מצרי or כנעני prove. The variations are greater where there is no basic name from which the gentilic noun can be derived, as in אמורי or פריזי (there is no *פרז or *אמור).

Ferrara and Constantinople are distinct in the translations of ישראלי, עברי and כושית. The term כושית is interpreted in C in its second occurrence in the verse as 'black' (ניגרה),[37] although in its first occurrence the Hebrew name is used in the translation. F uses the interpretation of Ethiopian like two of the medieval translations, although the others copy an approximate version of the Hebrew name or interpret כושית as 'strange'. ישראלי and עברי are consistently interpreted in C as ג׳ודייו~ג׳ודיאו 'Jewish', while F adopts ישראלי as *Ysraelita* from *Israel* and עברי as *Hebreo* from *Heber*. As mentioned above, the medieval translations also show variation in these nouns. The perception of ישראלי and עברי as 'Jewish' was apparently common among the Jews, but not among the Christians and the ex-Conversos to which F belongs, hence the difference among them. In the translation of יהודי as a gentilic noun, there is no difference between the translations, and they all render this term as 'Jewish'.

Ferrara and Constantinople have similar translations in 208 examples of the 272 tokens examined in this study (76%; 150 of 174 types – 86%), which is quite a high percentage. In contrast, the medieval translations show a clear resemblance among each other in 42 cases (15% of the 272 tokens), and a partial resemblance in 21 other cases (8%). This total of 23% similarities is very low.

Ferrara shows more resemblance to the medieval Spanish Bible than Constantinople. A comparison of F to E3, E4 and Alba, shows the following resemblance (of the 272 tokens sampled in this study):

F = E3: 106 tokens (38%)
F = E4: 84 tokens (31%)
F = Alba: 73 tokens (27%)

F clearly differs from E3, with more than 60% of the tokens. Namely, the difference is greater than the resemblance, and this difference increases in the other translations.[38] The comparison has not been made to C because the data showed more remoteness than both because of the orthography and because of the other differences presented

---

37 Based on some traditional interpretations, e.g., RaDaQ.
38 E5/E7 was not included in the statistics, but it would have shown results similar to E4; E19 has not been calculated because many verses were lacking in the comparison.

above. These findings lead us to the following question: Is it possible that the pre-exilic medieval Spanish Bibles were the source for the post-exilic Ladino translations?

The study of the romanized Bibles and their affinity to the Ladino Bibles has been investigated by several researchers.[39] The assumption was that these medieval translations from Escorial and Alba laid the foundation for the Ladino translations published in the sixteenth century. The arguments raised were as follows: (a) these Bibles were translated by Jews or with the help of Jews; (b) the translation was based on the Hebrew Bible rather than the Vulgate or other Christian versions; (c) the order of the books and the division of the Parashot follow the Hebrew Bible; (d) many instances show that the translations are based on Aramaic and Jewish interpretations found in the Bible. There were also arguments that although Christians initiated these Bible translations, Jews also might have used them.[40]

---

39 See, for example, Lorenzo Amigo, *El Pentateuco de Constantinopla y la Biblia Medieval Romaneceada Judeo-española*, Universidad Pontificia, Salamanca 1983; Andrés Enrique-Arias, "Texto subyacente hebreo e influencia latinizante en la traducción de la Biblia de Alba de Moisés Arragel", in Victoria Alsina, J. Brumme, C. Garriga & C. Sinner (eds.), *Traducción y estandarización. La incidencia de la traducción en la historia de los lenguajes especializados*, Iberoamericana Vervuert, Madrid/Frankfurt 2004, pp. 99-112; idem, "Apuntes para una caracterización de la morfosintaxis de los textos bíblicos medievales en castellano", in Johannes Kabatek (ed.), *Sintaxis histórica del español y cambio lingüístico: Nuevas perspectivas desde las tradiciones discursivas*, Iberoamericana Vervuert, Frankfurt/Madrid 2008, pp. 109-125; Francisco Javier del Barco, "La Biblia de Alba y la Biblia de Ferrara en su contexto lingüístico: la traducción de las formas verbales", en José Jesús de Bustos Tovar & José Luis Girón (eds.), *Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*, vol. 1, Alconchel Arco Libros, Madrid 2006, pp. 459-468; Hassán y Berenguer, *Biblia de Ferrara* (Note 20); Margherita Morreale, "La Biblia de Ferrara y el Pentateuco de Constantinopla", *Tesoro de los judíos sefardíes* (אוצר יהודי ספרד), 5 (1962), pp. 85-91; idem, "Las antiguas Biblias hebreas españolas en el pasaje del Cántico de Moisés", *Sefarad* 23 (1963), pp. 3-21. An extensive list of references can be found in http://www.bibliamedieval.es/bibliografia.html (accessed 29.4.2011).

40 See Moshe Lazar, "Targume hamiqra beladino [Bible Translations in Ladino from after the Expulsion]", *Sefunot* 8 (1964), pp. 337-375, especially p. 355; Moshe Lazar (ed.), *Biblia Ladinada: Escorial I.j.3*, The Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, Madison 1995, p. xiii; José Llamas, "La antigua Biblia castellana de los judíos españoles", *Sefarad* 4 (1944), pp. 219-244. Littlefield claimed the E19 was intended for Jewish readership, whereas E4 and E7 for Christians, and Alba and E3 were designated for both Jewish and Christian readers. See Littlefield, *Escorial Iii19* (Note 17), pp. viii-xiii.

Contrary to this assumption, a claim is made that the Jewish Bible translations are based on an oral tradition that started in the Middle Ages,[41] and they were only produced in writing after the expulsion from Spain, in the two major Iberian Diasporas of the Jews: the expelled Jews in the Ottoman Empire, and the ex-Converso communities in Italy and Holland. In spite of the geographical distance and the different orthography, the two Ladino translations closely resemble each other in their translation methods, and they are extremely different from the translation methods used in medieval Spain.

The use of personal names also distinguishes the Ladino translations from the medieval Spanish ones. The resemblance between C and F is much higher than between the medieval Spanish ones, as shown above. This resemblance cannot be accidental, and certainly cannot be attributed to any of the medieval translations. Therefore, the claim that the Ladino Bibles are based on the medieval Spanish translations cannot be supported.[42] The resemblance of C and F is justifiable only by assuming a long-lasting tradition of oral transmission of the Bible; this resemblance lasted until the onset of print production in the sixteenth century and afterwards. If the Ladino translations were based on the medieval written tradition extant among Christians, we would have found much more variety in the translation of the words, in personal names, toponyms, and gentilic nouns, because when copying such a long text, the translator would be influenced by the texts in front of him, and he would be unable to change them in a

41 See Eliezer Gutwirth, "Religión, historia y las biblias romanceadas", *Revista Catalana de Teologia* 13 (1988), pp. 115-134; David M. Bunis, "Tres formas de ladinar la biblia en Italia en los siglos XVI-XVII", in Hassán and Berenguer (eds.). *Introduccion a la Biblia de Ferrara* (note 20), pp. 315-345; David M. Bunis, "Translating from the Head and from the Heart: The Essentially Oral Nature of the Ladino Bible-Translation Tradition", in Winfried Busse and Marie-Christine Varol-Bornes (eds.), *Hommage á Haïm Vidal Sephiha*. Peter Lang, Berne 1996, pp. 337-357; Aldina Quintana, "From the master's voice to the disciple's script: Genizah fragments of a Bible glossary in Ladino", *Hispania Judaica Bulletin* 6 (2008), pp. 187-235.

42 See Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald, "On the Jewish Nature of Medieval Spanish Biblical Translations: Linguistic Differences between Medieval and Post-Exilic Spanish Translations of the Bible". *Sefarad* 70 (2010), pp, 117-140; Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald, "The Relationship between Ladino Liturgical Texts and Spanish Bibles", in Jonathan Decter and Arturo Prats (eds.), *Hebrew Literature, the Bible and the Andalusi Tradition in the Fifteenth Century*, Brill, Leiden and Boston 2012, pp. 223-243. Support for this view can also be found in Lorenzo Amigo Espada, "Una aproximación al Pentateuco de Constantinopla (1547)", *Estudios Bíblicos* 43 (1990), pp. 81-111.

consistent fashion. The fact that most proper names, toponyms and gentilic nouns retained their Hebrew pronunciation and that they show more consistency than in the translations made before the expulsion, proves that it was a reliable oral tradition. The translator of Ferrara was an ex-Converso. His translations demonstrate that although he used the Latin alphabet, only sparingly did he follow the Christian usage.

Finally, the copying of the Hebrew names in the translation is one of the clearest signs of the Jewish nature of the text. In Midrash Tehilim[43] the text states:

> ״אמר ר׳ אלעזר הקפר בזכות ארבעה דברים [נגאלו ישראל ממצרים], שלא שינו את שמם, ולא שינו את לשונם, ולא גילו את מסתורין שלהם, ולא היו פרוצים בעריות. החשוב מכולם לא שינו את שמם, (לראובן) [אלה] משפחות הראובני (במדבר כו ז), (לשמעון) [אלה] משפחות השמעוני (שם שם /במדבר כ״ו/ יד), כי נחתין ראובן ושמעון, וכי סלקין ראובן ושמעון״.

> R. Elazar Ha-Qapar says: For four reasons [Israel were redeemed from Egypt]: they did not change their names, they did not change their language, they did not reveal their secrets, and they did not engage in sexually immoral behavior. And the most important [reason] is that they did not change their names, (from Reuḇen) [one finds these are] the Reuḇeni families, (from Šimᶜon) [one finds these are] the Šimᶜoni families, because they went [into Egypt] as Reuḇen and Šimᶜon and got out as Reuḇen and Šimᶜon.

Although there is a change in language in the translations, the principle of retaining the Hebrew name was kept intact for personal names, toponyms, and gentilic nouns, Even when there is morphological adjustment to Spanish, the original Hebrew name is preserved as the stem, and that's what makes the texts Jewish, unlike the medieval Spanish translations.

---

43 Midrash Tehilim, Buber's edition, chapter 114, *The Responsa Project* 18+, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan (2010).

Appendix: The verses from which the names were taken

Gen. 2:10, 13-14; 4:2, 12, 18; 9:18; 5:4, 9, 16, 21; 10:2, 4, 6-7, 9-19, 24; 11:31; 13:10;
14:2, 5-7, 13; 15:19-21; 20:1-2; 215:3, 9-10, 18, 20, 26; 39:2, 14; 10:1, 15; 41:12,
34, 45; 43:32; 45:2; 47:15, 20; 21:2
Ex. 2:11, 12; 3:8, 17; 14:13; 21:2
Lev. 24:10
Num. 12:1; 24:24
Deut. 15:12
Jer. 36:21, 23
Zech. 8:23
Esther 2:5; 3:4